he should understand a methodical and systematic argument. made his challenge, I agreed to help him switch it from my committee, then after he had gotten the publicity and coverage from it, he came back in an article of the 6th, saying that he would not switch from my committee because the only other logical committee to refer to was the Judiciary of which I'm a member, which impuns that committee, it's chairman and every-thing that committee has stood for. Now Senator Proud is giving me an inordinate amount of influence with the committee members on both committees, I am one vote in either case, now he said that the logical committee is the Judiciary, but as we've seen from the way bills have been refered this session, logic has very little to do with it. I even told him I would help him get his bill before the Agriculture Committee but he didn't want to go for that. Now on the 18th which was yesterday, Senator Proud renewed his statements about my unfairness, and it says this, Proud said Saturday, he doesn't think he will get a fair hearing before Chambers' committee. I deeply resent the fact that the Chairman has come out against the resolution, it's like being accused of a crime and before the case is hear, the judge pronounces you guilty. Now he characterized this position as being that of an accused criminal not me. But Chambers said the 2:00 p.m. hearing will be fair. Mr. Proud will get a fair shake and he will be shaken fairly, Chambers said. Now why would it be fair for Senator Proud to make his position on this amendment clear, publicly repeatedly by television, newspapers, and radios, but I can not fairly state my position. I voted for ratification of the amendment and at the time, I voted, I was not empty headed as Senator Proud acknowledges that he was. I knew what I was doing, I'm not pleading temporary insanity, I'm not asking to run the same track twice. I knew where I was, I knew what I was voting on and I voted accordingly. and get this I'm a barber, he is an attorney. Isn't an attorney supposed to be careful of what he does? Isn't he supposed to know what actions he is taking, so that he can be legally and morally responsible for his actions. What he ought to do is just admit that he got a tiger by the tail and there must be something involved in this, other than what has been brought to us. He works for Mutual of Omaha, prior to being here in the legislature, I read that he was a lobbyst for an insurance company. Perhaps insurance companies are concerned about being able to pay women low wages. I don't know if this is his motivation, I'm not a reader of minds and no reader of hearts, but I can read the newspaper and I know what I've seen thus far. One thing that disturbs me and I'm about to wind it up, but I noticed people are listening this morning, that's flattering to me, or maybe the gravity of the subject is what causes everybody to listen, but anyway when Mr. Proud was elected Speaker of the Legislature, he stated that he was going to restore dignity to the Legislature, and his pattern of conduct up to now may have restored dignity to the Legislature, but he is certainly trying to strip dignity from me and my committee, so I feel that he is not been quite on the level in delivering on that pledge. Further more he asked Senator DeCamp a member of the Government committee to poll the membership and if everybody on the committee would promise that they would vote to advance his resolution to the floor, he would be kind and not take it from our committee. Well when he has to come down and admit the whole truth, there is no other committee that wants it, and the final bone crusher on the distinguished Senator, the honorable gentlemen from Omaha, who worked for Mutual of Omaha, one of the biggest Insurance Companies in the country, he was on the very reference committee that sent his resolution to my committee in the first place and one of the predominating reason that was given was that they felt, it would get a fair hearing. Thank you.

SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes Senatoar Proud.